

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Ma

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/385,959	08/30/99	YANAGIDA	T P99.1318

026263
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION
CHICAGO IL 60606-1080

MM41/0904

EXAMINER

GRAYBILL, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2814

DATE MAILED: 09/04/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/385,959	YANAGIDA, TOSHIHARU
Examiner	Art Unit	
David E Graybill	2814	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Applicant's election of invention II, claims 7-24, in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Figures 11-13B should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 9 the scope of the term "activated," in the claimed context, is unclear.

In claim 10 there is insufficient literal antecedent basis for the limitation "said resin film components deposited on said bumps."

In claim 20 the scope of the limitation "high melting point solder" cannot be determined because the term "high" is a vague

Art Unit: 2814

relative term of degree for which the disclosure provides no clear standard for measuring the degree, or it is not apparent if the degree is limited by the disclosure, and one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the prior art and the status of the art would not otherwise be reasonably apprised of the scope of the term.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 7-11, 16 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes (6114187).

At column 5, line 23 to column 7, line 32; and column 9, lines 1-35, Hayes teaches the following.

7. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus comprising: a first step of forming metal bumps 3 so as to connect to a circuit pattern of a semiconductor device 1, a second step of forming a resin film 4 on a circuit pattern forming surface of said semiconductor device so as to seal spaces between said metal bumps and to become thinner than a

Art Unit: 2814

height of the metal bumps, and a third step of cleaning the surfaces of the metal bumps projecting out from the resin film.

8. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, the surfaces are cleaned by removing components inviting a rise in a connection resistance and a decline in a joint strength at least at a connection interface.

9. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, the surfaces of the bumps are activated in parallel to the cleaning of the surfaces of the bumps.

10. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, said resin film components deposited on said bumps are removed.

11. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, oxides on said bump surfaces are removed.

16. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, the cleaning of the surfaces of the bumps is performed by irradiating a laser beam.

19. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein the metal bumps formed in the first

step are solder bumps and after the third step, further comprises a fourth step of forming solder layers 9 different in composition from the solder bumps on the surfaces of the solder bumps.

20. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 19, wherein said solder bumps are high melting point solder and said solder layers are comprised of a eutectic solder.

21. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 20, wherein, in said fourth step, the eutectic solder layers are formed by a printing method, plating method, or transfer method.

22. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein the steps up to at least the third step are performed on a semiconductor device formed on a semiconductor substrate in a semiconductor wafer 17 state.

23. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, further comprising a fourth step of cutting the semiconductor wafer into unit semiconductor chips after said third step.

24. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 23, further comprising a step of mounting a semiconductor chip on a mounting board from the bump forming

Art Unit: 2814

surface side so as to connect it at the bumps after said fourth step.

To further clarify the teaching wherein the surfaces of the bumps are activated in parallel to the cleaning, the surfaces are cleaned by removing components inviting a rise in a connection resistance and a decline in a joint strength at least at a connection interface, and oxides on said bump surfaces are removed, it is noted that these processes are inherent results of the cleaning process of Hayes.

To further clarify the teaching wherein the solder bumps are high melting point solder and said solder layers are comprised of a eutectic solder, attention is directed to column 7, lines 5, lines 53-57, wherein Hayes teaches that jetted solder can be a eutectic or other solder, and to column 7, lines 24-27, wherein Hayes teaches that the solder layers are "a lower melting composition" than the solder bumps, and "a different composition than the composition of the solder bumps." Therefore, Hayes teaches that the jetted solder layers are a eutectic solder, and the solder bumps are a higher melting composition (are a relatively high melting point solder) than the solder layers.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes as applied to claims 7-11, 16 and 19-24, and further in combination with Nishikawa (6227436) and Denning (6187682).

Hayes does not appear to explicitly teach the following:

12. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, the cleaning of the surfaces of the bumps is performed by plasma cleaning.
13. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 12, wherein said plasma cleaning is at least sputter etching by discharge plasma of an inert gas.
17. As a process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, the cleaning of the surfaces of the bumps is performed under a reduced pressure atmosphere, an inert gas atmosphere, or a reducing gas atmosphere.

Art Unit: 2814

Nevertheless, at column 5, line 62 to column 6, line 67, Nishikawa teaches a process of production of a semiconductor apparatus 1 wherein cleaning of the surfaces of bumps 9 is performed by sputter etching of an inert gas ("argon"). Moreover, it would have been obvious to combine the process of Nishikawa with the process of Hayes because it would enable cleaning of the surfaces of the bumps 3.

However, the combination of Hayes and Nishikawa does not appear to explicitly teach that the sputter etching is by discharge plasma. Still, at column 2, line 66 to column 5, line 50, Denning teaches a process of sputter etching by discharge plasma. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the process of Denning with the process of the applied prior art because it would enable sputter etching.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hayes, Nishikawa and Denning as applied to claims 12, 13 and 17, and further in combination with Okumura (4807021).

The prior art applied to claims 12, 13 and 17 does not appear to explicitly teach the following:

14. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 12, wherein said plasma cleaning is at least

Art Unit: 2814

oxygen plasma treatment and then sputter etching by discharge plasma of an inert gas.

15. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 12, wherein said plasma cleaning is at least oxygen plasma treatment and then sputter etching by discharge plasma of a reducing gas.

However, as cited supra, Denning teaches a process wherein plasma cleaning is sputter etching by discharge plasma of an inert and a reducing gas. Moreover, it would have been obvious to combine the process of Denning with the process of the applied prior art because it would enable cleaning.

Also, at column 5, lines 32-44, Okumura teaches a process of production of a semiconductor apparatus wherein plasma cleaning is at least oxygen plasma treatment. In addition, it would have been obvious to combine the process of Okumura with the process of the applied prior art because it would enable cleaning.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes as applied to claims 7-11, 16 and 19-24, and further in combination with Jackson (5068040).

Hayes does not appear to explicitly teach the following:

18. A process of production of a semiconductor apparatus as set forth in claim 7, wherein, in said third step, the cleaning of

Art Unit: 2814

the surfaces of the bumps is performed while applying a gas jet to the bumps to peel off the unnecessary components which are then sucked away.

Notwithstanding, at column 4, line 44 to column 5, line 33; and column 7, line 46 to column 8, lines 49, Jackson teaches a process wherein the cleaning of the surfaces of a semiconductor apparatus is performed while applying a gas jet to the apparatus to peel off the unnecessary components which are then sucked away. Additionally, it would have been obvious to combine the process of Jackson with the process of the applied prior art because it would enable cleaning.

Any telephone inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status (MPEP 203.08) of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

Any telephone inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Graybill at (703) 308-2947. Regular office hours: Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

The fax phone number for group 2800 is 703/305-3431.



David E. Graybill
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2814

D.G.
30-Aug-01